



JOHN NAIMO
ACTING AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

June 30, 2014

TO: Audit Committee

FROM: John Naimo
Acting Auditor-Controller

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John", is written over the printed name "John Naimo".

SUBJECT: **SUNSET REVIEW FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY HIGHWAY
SAFETY COMMISSION**

RECOMMENDATION

The Audit Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors (Board) to extend the Los Angeles County Highway Safety Commission's (Commission) sunset review date to October 31, 2017.

BACKGROUND

The Board established and has continued the Commission pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Chapter 15.16. The Board approved the most recent sunset review date extension in May 2011.

The Commission considers and investigates requests and suggestions related to traffic control made by the Board, commissioners, law enforcement, and the general public, and reports results and recommendations to the Board. The Commission also cooperates with other jurisdictions within Los Angeles County to eliminate and prevent major traffic problems and develop uniform traffic control standards and regulations (e.g., placement of signs, speed limits, signals, etc.) to ensure maximum safety for the public.

The Commission is comprised of seven members. Five members are appointed by the Board based on one nomination from each of the five Supervisors. The remaining two members are appointed by the Board from a list of nominees provided by the Los Angeles County Board of Education, private schools, and parochial schools. The Commission meets quarterly or as needed, and members receive a \$25 stipend per meeting (up to four meetings per month).

The Commission does not have an operating budget. The Department of Public Works (DPW) provides the Commission with necessary support staff, services, supplies, and stipends. DPW estimates that they incurred approximately \$28,900 in expenditures on behalf of the Commission during Fiscal Year 2012-13.

JUSTIFICATION

The Commission held 22 meetings from January 2010 to October 2013 (approximately 1.6 meetings per quarter). The average meeting attendance was 5.4 (77%) members.

The Commission primarily serves as an appeals board for members of the public who disagree with DPW's decisions regarding traffic control and regulations. The Commission reviewed 27 appeals during this evaluation period, denying 22 appeals and granting four appeals. The remaining decision is currently pending. In several instances where appeals were denied, the Commission made alternative traffic control recommendations that alleviated some of the concerns expressed by the public. DPW has taken action in response to the recommendations, including installation of speed display signs, stop signs, and crosswalks.

The Commission's objective for the coming period is to continue serving as an appeals board and developing positive relationships between the County and public (e.g., allow the public to voice concerns in a constructive environment, etc.). The Commission will also continue to focus on delivering timely decisions at meetings.

Please call me if you have any questions, or your staff may contact Robert Smythe at (213) 253-0101.

JN:AB:RS:YK

Attachment

c: Robert A. Ringler, Chair, Highway Safety Commission
Dean Lehman, Assistant Deputy Director, DPW
Irena Guilmette, Executive Officer, Highway Safety Commission
Twila P. Kerr, Acting Chief, Commission Services

COMMISSION SUNSET REVIEW
LOS ANGELES COUNTY HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMISSION
REVIEW COMMENTS

Mission. Does the mission statement agree with the Board of Supervisors' (Board) purpose and expectations?

The stated mission is as set forth in the ordinance establishing the Los Angeles County Highway Safety Commission (Commission). **CONCUR.**

Section 1. Relevance. Is the mission still relevant and in agreement with the Board's purpose and expectations?

The Commission primarily serves as an appeals board for members of the public who disagree with the Department of Public Works (DPW) decisions regarding traffic control and regulations.

The Commission's mission appears to be **RELEVANT.**

Section 2. Meetings and Attendance. Are required meetings held and is attendance satisfactory?

The Commission meets quarterly or as needed. They held 22 meetings from January 2010 to October 2013 (approximately 1.6 meetings per quarter). The average meeting attendance was 5.4 (77%) members.

The Commission's meeting frequency and attendance are **SATISFACTORY.**

Sections 3 and 4. Accomplishments and Results. Are listed accomplishments and results significant?

The Commission reviewed 27 appeals during this evaluation period. They denied 22 appeals and granted four appeals. The remaining decision is currently pending. In several instances where appeals were denied, the Commission made alternative traffic control recommendations that alleviated some of the concerns expressed by the public. DPW has taken action in response to the recommendations, including installation of speed display signs, stop signs, and crosswalks.

The Commission's accomplishments and results are **SIGNIFICANT.**

Section 5. Objectives. Are the objectives compatible with the mission and goals and relevant within the current County environment?

The Commission's objective for the coming period is to continue serving as an appeals board and developing positive relationships between the County and public (e.g., allow the public to voice concerns in a constructive environment, etc.). The Commission will also continue to focus on delivering timely decisions at meetings.

The Commission's future objectives appear **RELEVANT**.

Section 6. Resources. Are the resources utilized by the entity in support of the entity's activities warranted in terms of the accomplishments and results?

Commission members receive a \$25 stipend per meeting (up to four meetings per month). The Commission does not have an operating budget. DPW provides the Commission with necessary support staff, services, supplies, and stipends. DPW estimates that they incurred approximately \$28,900 in expenditures on behalf of the Commission during Fiscal Year 2012-13.

The Commission's expenses appear to be **WARRANTED**.

Section 7. Recommendation.

**EXTEND THE SUNSET REVIEW DATE FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMISSION TO OCTOBER 31, 2017.**